<u>REMARKS</u>

In the Office Action, Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 28 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,855,006 (Huemoeller), and Claims 24 to 26 and 29 to 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Huemoeller. The rejections are respectfully traversed and the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in light of the following comments.

The present invention of independent Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, and 21 searches for a pending task when an ending instruction is received from a user for instructing an information processing apparatus to terminate a use of the apparatus by the user, and notifying the user of the pending task found as part of the search operation. As a result, when the user inputs an ending instruction to terminate use of the apparatus, such as a log-out instruction, they can be reminded of upcoming pending tasks in their schedule.

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 5 is an information processing apparatus comprising a receiver that receives an ending instruction from a user for instructing the apparatus to terminate a use of the apparatus by the user, a search unit that searches for a pending task to be performed by the user within a predetermined timeframe when the receiver receives the ending instruction from the user, and a notifier that notifies the user of the pending task to be performed within the predetermined timeframe when the pending task is found by the search unit.

Amended independent Claims 15 and 21 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 5.

Amended independent Claim 7 is an information processing apparatus comprising a receiver that receives an ending instruction from a user for instructing the apparatus to terminate a use of the apparatus by the user, an inferring unit that infers a destination of the user based on a user's schedule when the receiver receives the ending instruction from the user, a search unit that searches for a pending task relevant to the inferred destination of the user when the receiver receives the ending instruction from the user, and a notifier that notifies the user of the pending task relevant to the destination of the user.

Amended independent Claim 17 is a method claim substantially corresponding to Claim 7.

Amended independent Claim 9 is an information processing apparatus comprising a receiver that receives an ending instruction form a user for instructing the apparatus to terminate a use of the apparatus by the user, an inferring unit that infers a person with whom the user is scheduled to meet based on a user's schedule when the receiver receives the ending instruction from the user, a search unit that searches for a pending task relevant to the person with whom the user is scheduled to meet when the receiver receives the ending instruction from the user, and a notifier that notifies the user of the pending task relevant to the person with whom the user is scheduled to meet.

Amended independent Claim 19 is a method claim substantially corresponding to Claim 9.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19 and 21. More particularly, the applied art is not seen

to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of searching for a pending task when an ending instruction is received from a user to terminate a use of an apparatus by the user, and notifying the user of the pending task, where the pending task is one to be performed within a predetermined timeframe (as claimed in Claims 5, 15 and 21), one that is relevant to a destination of the user that is inferred from a user's schedule (as claimed in Claims 7 and 17), or one that is relevant to a person with whom the user is scheduled to meet that is inferred from the user's schedule (as claimed in Claims 9 and 19).

Huemoeller is merely seen to disclose that a user turns on an alarm function for a scheduled event and selects the type of alarm indication to be provided. The alarm function is triggered at a predetermined amount of time before the event as set by the user. (Column 6, lines 35 to 48). Thus, while Huemoeller may notify a user of a pending task, the notification is not triggered by an ending instruction received from a user to terminate a use of an apparatus by the user. Rather, Huemoeller's alarm is triggered at a preset time before the scheduled event. Moreover, the pending task is not seen to correspond to any of one to be performed within a predetermined timeframe (as claimed in Claims 5, 15 and 21), one that is relevant to a destination of the user that is inferred from a user's schedule (as claimed in Claims 7 and 17), or one that is relevant to a person with whom the user is scheduled to meet that is inferred from the user's schedule (as claimed in Claims 9 and 19).

In view of the foregoing, Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19 and 21, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable over Huemoeller.

Independent Claims 23, 28 and 32 also concern notifying a user of a pending task, but the notification is performed when a new task is added to a schedule.

According the invention, when a new task is added to the schedule, a search is performed for a previously scheduled pending task relevant to the new task being added, and the user is then notified of the pending task. As a result, whenever a schedule is modified to add a new task, the user is reminded of previously scheduled pending tasks associated with (relevant to) the added task.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 23 is an information processing apparatus comprising a schedule storage, for storing a plurality of pending tasks, an entry adder, that adds a new task to the schedule storage, a search unit that searches the schedule storage for a previously scheduled pending task relevant to the new task when the entry adder adds the new task, and a notifier that notifies a user of the pending task relevant to the new task.

Independent Claims 28 and 32 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 23.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 23, 28 and 32. More particularly, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of searching a schedule storage for a previously scheduled pending task relevant to a new task when the new task is added to a schedule storage, and notifying a user of the pending task relevant to the new task.

The Office Action took the position that Huemoeller's column 2, lines 12 to 16 allegedly discloses searching for a pending task relevant to a new task being added to a schedule. However, this portion of Huemoeller merely states that, when a user is scheduling a new activity, such as a public entertainment event, various information

needed to schedule the activity is presented to the user (e.g., a listing of ticket prices, seating chart, etc.). Thus, when the user is adding the new activity, the user is presented with additional information to assist in adding the activity. The additional information is not, however, a previously scheduled task and is not a previously scheduled pending task that is relevant to the new task being added.

Moreover, the Office Action indicates that Huemoeller does not exclude the use of adding new tasks to its schedule; an apparent reference to meaning that since new tasks can be added to Huemoeller, pending tasks can be notified to the user when a new task is added. Applicants see this assertion as the Examiner interjecting his own disclosure into Huemoeller, which is simply inappropriate. Even if Huemoeller could be seen to include the ability to add new tasks, nothing in Huemoeller could possibly be seen to disclose notifying a user of a pending task relevant to a new task being added. Therefore, independent Claims 23, 28 and 32 are not believed to be anticipated by Huemoeller.

In view of the foregoing, independent Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 28 and 32, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,

California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to

our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. _42,746_

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-22
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200